

*Library of the Surgeon-General*  
2  
printed  
Pulley

OBSERVATIONS

ON A RECENTLY PUBLISHED WORK, ENTITLED

"THE FEVER AT BOA VISTA,

UNCONNECTED WITH THE

VISIT OF THE 'ECLAIR' TO THAT ISLAND,"

BY GILBERT KING, M.D.,

INSPECTOR OF HOSPITALS AND FLEETS.

BY J. O. M'WILLIAM, M.D., F.R.S. R.N.

MEDICAL INSPECTOR H. M. CUSTOMS.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM TYLER, BOLT-COURT.

1853.



# OBSERVATIONS,

&c.

---

SINCE the publication (in April, 1848) of my "Remarks on Dr. King's Report on the Boa Vista Fever," Dr. King has from time to time committed himself to sundry promises, or rather threats, to the effect, that he would speedily convince the Profession that they had wrongly estimated the value of our respective Reports on the subject of that epidemy.

Years, however, rolled on without any appearance of the promised work, until within the last few weeks, when, after a protracted period of incubation, and, it may be presumed, a corresponding degree of labour, Dr. King has at length produced an octavo volume of 110 pages, entitled, "The Fever at Boa Vista in 1845-6, unconnected with the Visit of the Eclair to that Island."

It may appear rather strange, that, at this late day, Dr. King should have been induced to re-open a question which had been considered by the great majority of the Profession and the professional press throughout Great Britain, France, and America, as long since finally disposed of. It may seem even still more extraordinary that I should trouble either the public or myself by further noticing the author of a Report which has long been condemned upon his own showing, and whose conclusions have been, by almost universal consent, declared to be logically irreconcilable with the premises upon which he sought to establish them.

But there is something to be said for Dr. King. He has met with severe disappointments and mortifications. He went out to Boa Vista a resolute anti-contagionist; he returned to England with his opinions more deeply rooted than ever; and, what was more, he brought home materials for a Report, which, he fondly imagined, could not fail to convince

the world that the Boa Vista epidemic was of endemic origin.(a)

His "Report," however, on being presented to the House of Commons, (March, 1848,) was not accompanied by any mark of support from the Director-General of the Medical Department of the Navy. In due time, the Report passed through the ordeal of criticism by the public press, the verdict of which, contrary to Dr. King's expectations, was to the effect, that from his Report, "which was intended to disprove contagion, the actual contagion and importation of the Boa Vista fever could be clearly made out;" and that it was in every respect useless, except that its main facts, so far as they went, corroborated the conclusions of my Report, which it was Dr. King's aim to overthrow.

Nor is Dr. King himself pleased with the manner in which his "Report" has been noticed by Sir William Pym and myself. We have not, it appears, deported ourselves as critics quite to his liking. "We have," he says (p. 100 recent work), "jumbled together statements, arguments, implications, and objections, *rudis indigestaque moles*, without the slightest regard to method or connexion." Dr. King, therefore, feeling convinced that Sir William Pym, myself, and the Press were equally incapable of doing him justice, resolved to do justice to himself. Accordingly, at pp. 93-4 of his recent work, he presents us with a review of *his own Report*, which is doubtless much more satisfactory to himself than anything yet produced on the subject by other Reviewers. By way of contrast, he very modestly prefaces this "Review" by his opinion of my Report. "Dr. M<sup>r</sup> William's argument rests on a partial and narrow view of the whole case, and is supported only by the vague evidence and opinions of persons who were neither competent nor disinterested witnesses. *Mine, on the other hand, is founded on a number of important and remarkable occurrences, coincident with the fever, which cannot be controverted, and which supply evidence absolutely necessary to enable us to form a just opinion.*" Unfortunately for Dr. King, the world refuses to be guided in their estimation of a work solely by the opinion of its author, else we should never hear of such a thing as a bad book or a bad report. It can do no harm, however, to leave Dr. King in the enjoyment of the very favourable view of his own Report recorded by himself. While I have no objection that mine should continue to be judged solely by the opinions of it which may be recorded by others.

---

(a) Dr. King states, (p. 80, "Boa Vista Fever unconnected," etc.) that his Report was sent in *shortly* after his return to England, in July, 1847. As I shall hereafter show that Dr. King is rather ambiguous in his mode of expressing time, it is desirable to know whether, on this occasion, Dr. King means a few days (as in the case of my own Report), a few weeks, or a few months.

When it is still further considered, that Dr. King believes that his "character as a physician and as a man of integrity has been assailed" by Sir William Pym and myself, it will easily be understood how pressing has been his desire to vindicate himself from such a charge, and in some degree to recover himself from the discomfiture that must have attended the failure of his Report. It is but just to Dr. King also to add, that another great object which he had in view in writing the present work, was the very laudable one of "removing a stumbling-block," which he considers "has been most unnecessarily placed in the way of inquirers" into the Boa Vista epidemic. (*Vide* Dr. King's recent work, p. 4.)

For myself, I cannot hesitate to declare that I believe Dr. King, notwithstanding his inconsistencies and proneness to error, to be wholly incapable of wilful misrepresentation; and that although I quite agree with the reviewer in the *Dublin Quarterly Journal of Medical Science*, who, when reviewing the Boa Vista question, considered "Dr. King a person with whom it is impossible to reason on the subject," I am, nevertheless, of opinion with the Reviewer, "that Dr. King has acted conscientiously." (a) It would be uncharitable to suppose that error cannot be committed unless by a conscious sacrifice of the truth.

It is not, then, with the vain hope of carrying conviction to the mind of Dr. King that I proceed to make a few remarks on his recent production. Nor do I feel that it is at all incumbent upon me again to argue the Boa Vista question with him. I consider it, however, a duty, as the book may fall into the hands of some who are unacquainted with what has been already written on the subject, to show that many of the statements which it contains are at variance with the real facts of the case, and that others are wholly incompatible with some of those which are to be found in his own "Report."

The first sixteen pages of Dr. King's book are taken up chiefly with the history of the "Eclair" before her arrival at Boa Vista, and with a disquisition on contagion and infection, the distinction between which Dr. King seems to have settled much at least to his own satisfaction. He does not agree with Sir William Pym, therefore we may infer that he does not consider yellow fever to be a disease *sui generis*. He does not admit that a remittent fever may become exalted so as to become yellow fever. He cannot seemingly understand how a disease not primarily contagious may have the quality of contagion impressed upon it, or that a disease may be altered in degree without being essentially altered.

---

(a) *Dublin Quarterly Journal of Medical Science*, No. XV., p. 193.

If Dr. King had taken the trouble to glance over some of the principle works on fever since the time of Pringle, he would have found authors, in whose company he needed to feel ashamed, advocating the doctrine of contingent contagion,—he would have found detailed the circumstances under which fevers may acquire this adventitious property, and he would have found that all the necessary conditions existed among the crew of the *Eclair*,—he would have found Dr. Bryson, whose writings he most justly eulogises, asserting that the *Eclair* fever became contagious (a); and he would also have found Sir William Burnett, in his Reports to the Lords of the Admiralty, stating that the disease in the *Eclair* was originally the “remittent fever of the coast,” exalted by causes which he mentions into a contagious yellow fever. (b)

At page 9 of his recent work, Dr. King states that “there was an unwonted combination of circumstances in the *Eclair*, even in her construction, unfavourable to the health of her crew;” and to this fault in construction, and to mud under the boilers and machinery, he attributes the re-appearance of fever in the vessel on her return to the coast, under the new name of the *Rosamond*.

But Dr. King does not stop here. He is determined that a cause in the ship herself shall account for fever breaking out on board the *Rosamond* for the third time (on the West Indian station) within the last few months.

Like others of Dr. King’s inferences, this inference also is groundless. The *Rosamond* sailed from Jamaica to Nicaragua, where she arrived on the 9th June, 1852, with her crew quite healthy. After fourteen days, the first case of remittent fever showed itself, and the disease ran through 77 people out of 150 men and officers. She eventually left the place on the 12th July, and nine days afterwards fresh cases ceased to occur, although only 51 per cent. of the people had gone through the disease when it stopped. The *Indefatigable* frigate, the *Persian* brig, and other men-of-war had, some time before, contracted fever in the same locality. To

---

(a) Epidemic Fever of Sierra Leone, etc., p 134. He might have ascertained that the disease, as I stated, had changed for the worse on the passage from Sierra Leone to Boa Vista, and still more so at Boa Vista. Dr. Bryson (p. 121 “Epidemic Fevers of Sierra Leone,”) says, “the cases of fever which occurred during the stay at Boa Vista, with the exception of *being more malignant*, and, consequently, of shorter duration, were not different from those that occurred on the passage along the coast from Sierra Leone.” Mr. Machonchy, in his private notes, has remarked, that *at first when the fever began to be prevalent, the worst symptoms came on gradually, but now the vomiting commences on the second day, and sometimes even on the first, and never ceases until the cold sweat is out, and the patient is moribund. One man was attacked in the afternoon, and had black vomit before midnight. As for medicine, in the really true cases, it can hardly be said to have any effect.*”

(b) Admiralty Correspondence on *Eclair*, p. 55.



all who are not blinded by the most narrow prejudice, it will be apparent, that in the *Rosamond*, as well as in the other ships, it was the locality the ship was in, not any cause in the ship herself, that gave rise to the fever on the occasion in question.

Dr. Watson, the Surgeon of Port Royal Hospital, Jamaica, who received the sick crew of the *Rosamond*, says:—"From associations connected with the former history of the *Rosamond*, there was a considerable panic, and a very general impression among her people that the cause of this illness was something in the ship. It is quite clear that this could not have been the case."<sup>(a)</sup>

But to the main question. The history of the fever in the *Eclair*, and at the island of Boa Vista, presents salient points which, fortunately, cannot be mistaken. The arrival of the *Eclair* at Boa Vista with yellow fever among her crew,—the perfect state of health of the inhabitants at this period,—the landing of the sick crew on a small island off Boa Vista,—the increased mortality among the crew while at this island,—the re-embarkation of the survivors, sick and healthy,—the attack and death of two Portuguese soldiers on the same island a few days after the crew were re-embarked,—the attack of another soldier (a negro) soon after the deaths of his European comrades, and the consequent removal of himself and another negro comrade to the island of Boa Vista,—the attack and death of a European woman on that island who attended these soldiers, and who lived next door to them,—the gradual spread of the disease over the whole island,—and the immunity from the disease secured to those who adopted measures of isolation and segregation,—are all facts standing out in relief so bold as to defy all attempts of artifice to distort, or in any wise to disfigure them. They are, indeed, all (with the exception of the last-named) fully admitted in Dr. King's Report.

Dr. King, in his recent work (pp. 16, 17,) seems to consider it a decided proof against the contagiousness of the disease, that it was not earlier communicated to the inhabitants of Boa Vista through the persons from the shore who visited the ship on her first arrival, and the fort after the crew were landed on the small island,—through the clothes that were sent on shore to be washed,—through the labourers on board the *Eclair* and on the small island,—through the officers of the *Eclair* living in the house at Santa Barbara in Porto Sal Rey,—and, lastly, through Captain Estcourt and the purser of the ship, both of whom, Dr. King alleges, had fever in

---

(a) See a very clear account of the epidemic fever which occurred at Greytown, Nicaragua, on board H.M.S. *Rosamond*, formerly *Eclair*, by John Watson, M.D., Surgeon Royal Naval Hospital, Jamaica, *Edinburgh Monthly Journal of Medical Science*, for November 1852, p. 441.

the town, and thus brought "a numerous class of persons in close approximation with the disease."

Now, supposing these assumptions to be correct, they can only be regarded in the light of mere negative evidence; but in the main points they are wholly incorrect.

Dr. King, in his recent work, p. 17, accuses me of an "attempt to throw the linen" of the sick of the *Eclair* overboard, and affirms that it was not so disposed of. In reply to this accusation, I beg to refer those who have any doubts on the subject to the evidence of the acting commander of the *Eclair*, Captain Harston ("Correspondence on Subject of *Eclair*," p. 28,) and to the sick-list of the *Eclair*, which shows that two officers only were sick between Sierra Leone and Boa Vista, and that both of them recovered. Dr. King may affirm what he pleases, but the evidence I have alluded to is on record, and is against him. As respects the house in Santa Barbara, it was wholly given up to the officers, and, contrary to what Dr. King states, it was not occupied for some weeks after its evacuation by them, and then not before it had been well cleaned and whitewashed. It was Senhor de Sâ, the Chief Justice, with his two European attendants, who occupied the house after the officers left. The owner of the premises was Senhor Librao, a negro, who had no European servants whatever.

With regard to Captain Estcourt, as I have elsewhere said, no man could have taken more precautions against infecting others than he did when living in Mr. Macaulay's house; and, at the time he was taken unwell, there were only black servants in the house. I need scarcely add, that he went to the fort, in accordance with the stringent rule he had applied to others the moment he felt at all ill.

As respects the purser, he certainly, as Dr. Stewart said, "went to the Consul in a state of delirium;" but the disease under which he laboured was not "fever," but "delirium tremens." (a)

So much for Dr. King's "attempt" to bring a numerous class of persons into close "approximation with the disease."

It is well known that the *Eclair*'s crew were re-embarked, and that the ship left Boa Vista on the 13th of September; also that two European Portuguese soldiers were attacked with yellow fever at the fort and died. To prevent cavil, we shall say with Dr. King, on the 20th and 21st September respectively. (b)

---

(a) The late Mr. Macaulay, in a letter to me, says, "The Purser, though generally, I was told, a temperate man, was induced by alarm at the progress of the 'Eclair fever,' to drink a great quantity of spirits, which brought on 'delirium tremens;' and it was whilst he was in this state, that he paid the visit to the Consul."

(b) At p. 6, of my "Remarks," &c., I ask, "How are these startling facts to be explained? Two soldiers, in sound health, go from an island



These deaths were ascribed by Dr. King, in his Report, to the great susceptibility of the soldiers to the attack of "*endemic fever*." But as the Eclair fever was a new disease in Boa Vista, it was necessary for Dr. King to provide a new cause for this "*endemic*," so he invoked an "*epidemical constitution*" of the atmosphere about the end of September or beginning of October; but, as the men died before this period, he called to his aid two privies and a dusthole, besides the crowded sick crew at the fort. These explanations, except the presence of the sick crew, having been severally or collectively pronounced to be inadmissible, Dr. King, in his recent work, offers, on the authority of "Parent Duchatelet," the soil from the privies in the form of "poudrette;" as also intemperance, bad water, and unwholesome meat. Dr. King is an old officer, and he surely will not, on reflection, re-assert that carrion is ever served out to the crews of Her Majesty's ships. When meat of any kind is considered unwholesome, it is surveyed by the officers of the ship, and, if necessary, condemned.

But I have the best reason to know that the meat was perfectly sound. It was supplied by the Vice-Consul, and was the same as that with which the tables of the Consul, of Mr. Macaulay, of the Governor-General, and others, were provided, and they experienced no bad effects from its use.

The brackish water was surely much more likely to produce diarrhœa or dysentery than yellow fever.

And if proof of the contagiousness of any disease is to be set aside by the intervention of a privy or a dust-hole, then the question must, in all cases, be wholly incapable of proof, as these must always exist, in some shape or other, where men are congregated together, even in the rudest state of society. These alleged causes, as well as Dr. King's present endeavours to invoke malaria before the death of the soldiers, may be safely left in the hands of the Profession. I will only observe, that Dr. King's charge, in his recent work, (p. 74,) that I had "only lately and reluctantly admitted, that the place was much overcrowded," is at variance with fact; for I have particularly alluded to this condition of the crew at the Fort, in my "Report," (pp. 78, 79, 104,) and in my "Remarks," etc. (pp. 7, 8.)

I have, in the "Remarks," (p. 7,) plainly told Dr. King,

everywhere healthy to another island where there are many sick and some dying daily. They also sicken and die."

Dr. King does not question the healthiness of the island, (Boa Vista,) but he is never at a loss to invoke a cause, independent of the sick crew of the Eclair. On this occasion he says, "But it was in an unhealthy season." Now, the state of health enjoyed by the inhabitants of a place is, I believe, a fair criterion of the healthiness or unhealthiness of a "season;" and if Boa Vista, at the period in question, is to be tried by this not unreasonable test, then it was *not unhealthy*. Probably Dr. King means "the season ought to have been unhealthy."

that he approached the real cause only when he spoke of the atmosphere being "polluted by the overcrowding of the place, the exposure of the clothes, bedding," etc., etc.

With an almost inconceivable disregard for the statements contained in his "Report," Dr. King now endeavours to make it appear that Miguel Barbosa was not taken ill until November!! In his Report, p. 6, he says, "*Miguel Barbosa informed me that he was attacked with slight fever some days after his comrades died at the Fort.*" (They died, according to Dr. King, on the 20th and 21st September respectively.) Dr. King nowhere in his "Report" questions the accuracy of this information. Five years' labour, however, has enabled Dr. King to discover one mistake in the answer of Barbosa to one of my questions, to the effect, that when he left the house in Beira, he found Luis Briza sick in barracks, which is simply impossible, seeing that Briza did not die until November 12th.

Does not Barbosa state to me, (Dr. M'William's Report, Q. 234 a.,) "I was still complaining when I went to the barracks?" And Dr. King will hardly contend that he did not go there until November. But I will not insult those who have taken an interest in the Boa Vista epidemy by recapitulating the overwhelming evidence against Dr. King's "new version" of Barbosa's illness. Should any, however, have a doubt on the subject, I would refer them to the evidence of John Jamieson, of Pedro Manoel, of Silvester José Romess, of Joana Teixeira, of Senhor Carvahal, of Corporal da Cruz Silva, of Senhor Joao Baptista, and to that of the Correspondence *in full* of the Consul and the late Mr. Macaulay.

The extracts that have been made by Dr. King and others from the letters of Mr. Macaulay, would surely lead people to infer that that gentleman considered the disease at Boa Vista as of endemic origin. Other extracts, however, dispel all idea that he had any such opinion regarding the real cause of the disease. In his letter to the Earl of Aberdeen, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, dated at St. Nicholas, Dec. 24, 1845, he says: "Judging after the event, it is not difficult to see, that a different course of proceeding, on both sides, would have saved us from our present troubles." "But this circumstance does not necessarily imply, that in any particular quarter we are justified in imputing blame, except so much as we may all equally share for not having apprehended danger when (as it has been already too plainly shown) it ought to have been apprehended and provided against. Had the building" (at the Fort) "which was so long used as a fever hospital been properly fumigated and purified prior to its re-occupation; and had the soldiers who were there seized with fever been kept (like the fever patients of the *Eclair*) from all intercourse

*with the densely-peopled and closely-built town, no bad consequences would have been experienced from the visit of the Eclair."*

Before proceeding to Anna Gallinha, the next link in the chain at Porto Sal Rey, it is desirable to ask one or two questions. Dr. King, in his recent work, p. 99, says:—"I certainly examined a few more of the soldiers than Miguel Barbosa." How many more? Why not examine them all? Were those that were examined interrogated by Dr. King himself, or was this part of the duty performed by deputy? These inquiries, as I shall soon show, are not made without reason. At p. 30 of Dr. King's recent publication, he says:—"The only authority for the dates of the attack and death of Anna Gallinha, is the oral testimony of John Jamieson." "That date," says Dr. King, "is assumed as a positive fact, and becomes the basis on which the Doctor has constructed the elaborate but artificial hypothesis which has been so much admired," etc. My words are, ("Dr. M'William's Report," p. 85):—"It is not easy to ascertain dates with precision, but it is probable that this woman was taken ill on the 12th, and died on the 16th, of October." This statement was not made without very minute and careful inquiry on the spot, of the most intelligent people, including John Jamieson, who were on the island while I was there. And I may add, that the information thus obtained afterwards derived ample corroboration from several English persons of the highest rank who were in the island at the time of Anna Gallinha's death. Of all who contributed to this further evidence, no one went wider of my dates than three days, and even that deviation occurred in one case only. The rest were for the dates as stated by me, constituting, surely, corroboration as complete as, in a case of this kind, can ever be expected. All those persons, save one, are alive, and can, if necessary, answer for themselves; from the other I fortunately have a document in my possession in proof of what I have stated.

But I must summon another witness in corroboration of the accuracy of my dates, *and that is Dr. King himself*. At p. 6 of his "Report," he says:—"Anna Gallinha, (*who was attacked on the 12th, and died on the 16th, of October,*) was, I believe, the first who died from fever in the island of Boa Vista."

A statement like this, in a public document, certainly has every appearance of having been made with assurance and precision. It was either made upon good authority, or it was not. If the authority were doubtful, or not entitled to reliance, then Dr. King was culpable in entertaining it at all. He has brought forward no reason why it is not equally worthy of being received now as it was then. And surely, when he wrote it, he intended it to be believed. It is true

he now apparently wishes to revoke the sentence altogether; but, in a case of this kind, Dr. King must not even be allowed to contradict himself without some show of reason, and he has shown none; save, indeed, now that he sees the rather ignominious failure of his own "Report," a very manifest desire, at all hazards, to consign mine to the same fate.

Before leaving Porto Sal Rey, I feel called upon again to advert to a subject which was very reluctantly alluded to by me in my "Observations on the Second Quarantine Report of the Board of Health," namely, Dr. King's method of investigation at this important district. I stated, (p. 22, Observations, &c.,) "As respects Porto Sal Rey, the mode in which Dr. King obtained his evidence there was chiefly, if not wholly, thus:—His list of queries was written down, and John Jamieson, the Consul's storekeeper, alone went the round of the houses, getting answers to those queries in the best manner he could, and then brought them to Dr. King, who transcribed them, thus obtained, into his own journal or note-book."

To this Dr. King has, in his recent work (p. 101), thus replied:—"It is quite correct: the information was obtained in that manner, and transcribed into my journal," etc. Dr. King goes on to explain (p. 101), it "occurred to me that it might be useful were I to visit every house in Porto Sal Rey." (a) He accordingly resolved, first, to send John Jamieson round the houses as a pioneer. But it eventually turned out that John Jamieson became a much more important functionary than Dr. King had at first intended. As the queries "were only completed and fully transcribed on the evening" before Dr. King left the island, he did not go the round of the houses himself. Jamieson's document, therefore, forms the only investigation concerning Porto Sal Rey in Dr. King's possession. As if to leave the matter beyond all doubt, Dr. King adds, (p. 102 of his recent work,) "Supposing I had visited the houses myself, what advantage could have accrued from it?" Possibly none: but I have always understood that it was required of medical men, when employed in the investigation of epidemic diseases, minutely to examine *in person* the localities where such diseases had prevailed, instead of delegating that important part of the duty to persons ignorant of medicine and the correct method of medical inquiry.

It was surely incumbent upon him to visit the celebrated "Beira Row," where the sickness first broke out in Porto Sal Rey, where Anna Gallinha, and Lisboa, the writer, died.

---

(a) Dr. King's excuse for not going the round of the houses is his ignorance of the Portuguese language; and he takes the unwarrantable liberty to class me with himself in respect to this ignorance. I will only observe, that *this* is another of the many assumptions of Dr. King, made without grounds.



He might have found by careful interrogation of Senhor Carvahal, a most intelligent man, (Judge of Porto Sal Rey,) that Lisboa, who lived in the Beira Row, did not, as stated by Dr. King, (p. 28 of his recent work,) upon the authority of his deputy, take ill and die in November, but that he was dead before the end of October. (See Senhor Carvahal's examination, Dr. M'William's "Report," p. 31.)

It is, however, but justice to John Jamieson to state that in my opinion the scale of questions which Dr. King gave him were wholly inadequate to obtain the particulars of the case. Moreover, Dr. King may have committed the mistake as to time in transcribing the result of Jamieson's labours to his note-book or journal.

Dr. King's mode of inquiry was, of course, in his own estimation, the best that could be adopted. But it does occur to me, that the Profession and the public in this country would not have attached the confidence they did attach to the report of the accomplished physician who, in 1848, was employed by the General Board of Health to investigate the first cases of cholera that occurred at that time in London, had he, instead of visiting the localities where the disease prevailed, dispatched his butler with written queries to get answered as he might, and drawn out his Report from the results thus obtained!

Dr. King states that I have "invested the case of Luis Pathi, at Rabil, with great importance." It is quite true that I have done so, and, were corroborative proof wanting of the claim of this case to unusual attention, it might be found in the fact of Dr. King having considered it necessary to be present in person at the examination of Pathi.

Dr. King, in his "Report," laid the chief argument against contagion in Pathi's case on the fact, that "he had yet to learn when and where the man was within the sphere of its influence."

Now that it cannot be doubted that Pathi was so exposed, Dr. King seizes, with the eagerness which dearth of argument produces, the fact of my having, in my "Remarks," insisted upon Pathi's exposure to contagion from being on board at the time the sick were re-embarked; while in my "Report" I merely stated, in addition to the circumstances of his having been employed in the lower deck of the Eclair, and of the strong suspicions of his having a coverlet from the Eclair in his possession, that he was on board, as well as many others, at the period in question.

That I should dwell upon any one cause more at one time than at another, surely cannot alter the facts of the case, although it may present a very tempting ground for cavil to one who has nothing else to argue upon.

That Pathi was exposed to sources of contagion, both directly and indirectly, is not to be denied.



Dr. King is very indignant that I should mention even the suspicion that Pathi had some article of bedding from the Eclair in his possession: he, however, does not hesitate to accuse the whole population of exaggeration and falsehood, for the purpose of extorting compensation from the British Government.

In all communities, there are some designing characters, and Dr. King took the very means to bring such people about him, if not, indeed, to produce such characters. He felt necessitated to hold out a pecuniary inducement to the people to give evidence. I never found anything of this kind at all necessary. The people came to me without any entreaty, and, whether they did or not, I very soon went to them, and with them examined and inspected, from house to house, all over the island. The case given by Dr. King (p. 49) proves only that the attempt at imposition was practised upon himself, not upon me. Pedro Ascensao did not attempt to tell me he had had fever in 1845; he, however, told Dr. King that he was attacked in October of that year. I held out no inducement for exaggeration or misrepresentation. Dr. King, unintentionally, but unfortunately, did hold out such an inducement; and the result was, as might have been expected, even in places more enlightened than Boa Vista. (a) Hence the alleged constant repetition of the symptoms of "black vomit" among those interrogated by Dr. King may be explained.

My "Report" rests not solely upon the evidence obtained from "the poor, uneducated, and neglected beings" of Boa Vista. I had the further privilege and advantage of either seeing or corresponding with nearly every European of importance who was in the island when the Eclair arrived. The main facts of my "Report" have been corroborated by several of them, and the conclusions it contains have received the unqualified assent of all. Dr. King seems to

---

(a) In my observations on the "Second Report on Quarantine, by the General Board of Health," I felt called upon to defend the people of Boa Vista from the accusations unfairly brought against them in that "Report." Possibly, my defence of these people constitutes what Dr. King, in his peculiarly elegant and courteous phraseology, designates "maudlin sentimentalism." His words are:—"The testimony of incompetent and interested witnesses has been accredited, and, to heighten the effect, their evidence has occasionally been *tricked* out in a disguise of maudlin sentimentalism."—Dr. King's recent Work, p. 4.

Dr. King was about *six weeks* on the island, and he had very little opportunity of knowing much of the people. The following testimony to their general character, by an accomplished English lady, who was *several years* at Boa Vista, is to be found in a pamphlet just published:—

"They are a simple, gentle race, very susceptible of kindness, skilled in all the arts of peasant life, very apt in acquiring knowledge, as she had many opportunities of observing in a school which she collected and taught among them, and, according to their measure of instruction, unaffectedly influenced by religious feeling."—"Slavery Past and Present," by a Lady, pp. 15, 16.

have been less fortunate in his means of acquiring information; but he certainly astonishes me when he says in his recent work, that "he had not the honour of knowing Senhor Carvahal," who certainly was at Porto Sal Rey while Dr. King was there. Senhor Carvahal was the Judge of Porto Sal Rey; he spoke English fluently; he was a traveller, and had seen, and experienced in his own person, yellow fever at San Domingo, in the West Indies; he was, moreover, a most communicable and intelligent man. I can assure Dr. King, that the Judge of Porto Sal Rey was a very superior person to the Judge of "Fundo das Figueiras;" and as he rested satisfied with the account of the fever in the Eastern villages as given by the latter alone, he might, with equal propriety and much greater advantage, have interrogated the former as to the outbreak at Porto Sal Rey.

Had Dr. King taken the trouble to extend his means of ascertaining facts, either by seeing or corresponding with the many intelligent Europeans who were on the island at the period in question, we should have heard less of his wonders and doubts regarding "the real grounds which influenced the doctors in their decision" as to the real nature of the disease, and the period at which it was "declared to be infectious."

He might also have understood how what he calls the "social revolution that took place in Porto Sal Rey" was brought about, and that the Governor-General and others were perfectly aware of the extent if not of the nature of the disease, before they left the island. (a) He would further have been assured, that Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Pettingall, and others, *did* leave the island by reason of "sickness among the inhabitants;" and that Mr. Pettingall's object in going to San Nicolao was *not*, as Dr. King surmises, "to make arrangements for the expected marriage of his daughter with Mr. Miller," as Mr. Miller at the period in question was in England. (See Dr. King's *doubts* on these points, in his recent work, pp. 21, 22.)

Even John Jamieson does not escape from the general and wholesale accusation of fraudulent intention which Dr. King brings against the people. He is represented as exaggerating the state of sickness on the island to Dr. King before he landed. At Rabil, he is said to have been "quite as decided a contagionist as Dr. M'William, and just as anxious to make converts to his opinion; and that he endea-

(a) His Excellency, in a letter to Dr. King, which did not reach its destination, after alluding to the delicate health of his wife, says:—

"I believe the attack was produced by the continued frights and anguishes that she endured during the long stay that we made at Boa Vista, in the presence of the terrible fever, seeing so many victims fall around ourselves, and expecting every moment that our own lives would be ingloriously lost."

voured to place the case" of Luis Pathi before Dr. King "in a light different from the truth."

While I utterly disbelieve any dishonesty in John Jamieson, I would ask, in the name of all that is consistent and proper, even supposing Dr. King's accusations against Jamieson to be well founded, how was it that Dr. King *afterwards* employed a person whom he had discovered exaggerating and tampering with important evidence, in the exclusive investigation of the facts relating to the outbreak and general history of the fever in Porto Sal Rey. It is not safe for Dr. King to endeavour thus to inculcate Jamieson.

I maintain that my account of the outbreak at Rabil is the correct one; and, in proof, appeal to the evidence of Luis Pathi, and to the evidence of others, in my Report. With regard to Dr. King's examination of Luis Pathi, it is much to be regretted that it is not published; more especially as few can claim the power which he possesses, namely, that of knowing what is passing at the distance of nearly 2000 miles; for, at p. 43, he says, "Luis Pathi is asked, (by Dr. M'William,) *in the most bland and insinuating manner*, and with a heart no doubt overflowing with benevolence, 'Did you not take some small article of clothing which you got on board the Eclair with you to Rabil?'"(a)

Although Dr. King has not given us an opportunity of knowing how he shaped his questions to Pathi, or what were the precise answers returned, he has not only given the words of my question regarding the coverlet, but the manner in which it was put.

It is not easy to understand how Dr. King came to this knowledge, but it is sometimes observed that individuals to whom nature has been stinted in the allotment of the faculties in general are gifted with an unusual development of some faculty in particular. Is it upon some such principle of compensation as this that Dr. King has been endowed with the marvellous property of "clairvoyance"?

Dr. King's essay at topographical description in no way improves his case at Rabil. A reference to the map will show that Moradinha must still remain in the ravine, and Cabecada and Boaventura must continue high above the ravine, just as I placed them. "Chao de Luz," or, as Dr. King calls it, "Chain de Losna," is simply a small row of houses in Boaventura.(b)

(a) Dr. King wishes to make it appear (p. 44 of his recent work) that Pathi was not carried home from Moradinha. Let me refer my readers to the evidence of Pathi himself; to that of Manoel da Silva Marques, *who assisted to carry him*; and to that of José Marques, who states, that Pathi was brought home.—Dr. M'William's Report, p. 42.

(b) It is to be regretted that Dr. King, before giving in his Report, did not get some one acquainted with the Portuguese language to see to the orthography of the names of places and persons. A Portuguese will hardly

At "Estacia de Baixo" and "Moradina," Dr. King makes a feeble effort to render my statements inconsistent with each other. At page 90 Dr. M'William's Report it is stated, with reference to "Estacia de Baixo," that a "great proportion of the people in the village had attacks of various degrees of intensity;" and at p. 91 Dr. W'William's Report it is said that *three deaths took place at Moradinha, "in a population of 101 persons, about half of whom were said to have been attacked with fever."* Again, at p. 106 Dr. M'William's Report, the following passage occurs: "Moradinha, which is situated in the Rabil ravine, and Estacia de Baixo, which overlooks it, (both of which places have come in for a great share of remittent fever at any time that disease was prevalent,) were in a most unaccountable degree exempt from fever during the late epidemic."

Dr. King is heartily welcome to all the benefit his case can derive from the alleged *inconsistency* of these statements.

At page 12 of my "Remarks" I state: "When fever was raging at Rabil, high above the ravine, there were only two persons at all sick in 'Moradinha,' which lies almost in its bed." Again: "Estacia de Baixo, which, all the year round, overlooks, and is nearer to the site of the swamps in the lower end of the ravine than any other part of the island, suffered least of all from fever, for, in a population of 256 persons, only three deaths took place, while the average mortality was one in 15'4."

The degree of exemption, then, was intended to apply to the small mortality of these localities, theoretically the most unhealthy, compared with that of the other localities, which, theoretically, ought to have been healthy, on the assumption that the fever was of miasmatic or indigenous origin.

But my statements are perfectly reconcilable after the most careful, and even malignant, sifting of the language in which they are expressed. At unhealthy "Moradinha," *one half of the inhabitants were attacked, whereas, on the island generally, two-thirds at least were attacked.* And this number was considered by the Europeans rather below than above the actual number attacked.

The eastern villages, "Cabeca dos Tharafes," "Fundo das Figueiras," and "Joao Gallego," form a very important district as regards the fever of Boa Vista.

In my "Report" I stated that the fever was introduced at the end of October into Cabeca dos Tharafes (the first of the three villages attacked) by the daughter of Captain Aniceto, who came from Porto Sal Rey, where she had been living in the house of Antonio Joaquim Lima.

---

recognise in his own language many of the names in the list appended to Dr. King's Report, p. 15,—such as "Des Doas de Nash," "Miguel Jing Jong," etc., etc. Certainly no persons with such names were ever employed about the Eclair.



Dr. King did not question this channel of introduction in his Report, nor does he challenge it in his recent work, further than stating that there was no fever in Lima's house until November. Where did he get this information? Was it obtained by deputy? And, if so, did he mistake in transcribing the results of John Jamieson's investigation? Seeing that the importation of the disease into the village is not disputed, it may be matter of little importance, but careful inquiry would have told Dr. King that there was fever in Lima's house before November, although Lima himself was not attacked until this period, and that "Theresa Maria Jesus," who was attacked shortly after Anna Gallinha died, was the mistress of Lima.

But why should I condescend to say more regarding these villages. Important as they were, and requiring of me, as their investigation did, repeated visits and minute examination, Dr. King was once only in the district; and, as regards "Cabeca dos Tharafes," the most important by far of the three, Dr. King did not once enter it.

But his reasons for not proceeding to this village must be told by himself. In reply to my statement, to the effect, that I had good reason to believe Dr. King did not once enter this village, he says in his recent work, p. 101, "Why should I have done so? I got all the information that was to be obtained from the chief person of the district, the judge at 'Fundo das Figueiras.' Cabeca dos Tharafes certainly contained seventy-three huts, but at that time there was not one sick person in the village."

Dr. King's reasons are certainly original in their way. At Porto Sal Rey, he told us that there could be no advantage in his visiting the houses himself, as he "must necessarily have had John Jamieson with him as interpreter; and it would have rested solely with him to repeat or contradict the facts he had supplied on the preceding day." As regards Cabeca dos Tharafes, it is not easy to understand how Dr. King, who examined the judge only, could assure himself that he (the judge) "possessed *all the information* that was to be obtained." That the judge's evidence was either correct, or all that was to be procured, are points that could only be fully determined by a comparison with the evidence of others.

Surely it would have been better had Dr. King gone into "Cabeca dos Tharafes," if for no other purpose than to confirm the testimony of the Judge by that of others procured on the spot.

With regard to the other reason, that there were no sick persons in the village at that time, Dr. King's mission was quite as much to inquire into the past, as it was into any existing epidemic; and if he had acted upon this reason on every occasion, why he ought not to have entered upon any



inquiry at Boa Vista at all; for, on his arrival at the island, he only found "one person (a slave) ill at Porto Sal Rey;" and "in a few days every other part of the island equally healthy." Dr. King seems to have preferred, what he may very properly call the "short-road system," as the "judge" at Fundo das Figueiras" appears to have stood sponsor for the whole three villages.—(Dr. King's recent work, pp. 90, 91.)

Let us for a moment suppose (what is by no means improbable,) that Dr. King is requested by the "General Board of Health" to investigate an outbreak of cholera in the celebrated district of Jacob's Island, Bermondsey. What will the Board, what will the Profession say to him, if, instead of proceeding to the district itself, he shall see fit to stop short on the north side of London-bridge, and, having interrogated some "judge" in the City, shall proceed to draw out a Report upon the information obtained from this single source?

Dr. King, for reasons best known to himself, has not seen fit to advance beyond the mere threshold of the outbreak of the fever in July, 1846; but what he has stated is full of error; and this is the more to be wondered at and regretted, seeing that, to obtain most accurate information he had no necessity to employ an interpreter, to send out queries on paper, or even to leave his lodging; for, as he tells us, the person first attacked was John Jamieson, who lived in the same house (the Consulate) with Dr. King.

Dr. King's account of this re-appearance of the fever is as follows:—"There was this remarkable coincidence, that after an INTERVAL OF SOME MONTHS, and the disappearance of the disease, both in man and beast, the same fever broke out again in the towns and villages ABOUT THE RAINY SEASON in the following year." (Dr. King's Report, page 9.)

In his recent work, Dr. King scarcely ventures a step further. He, indeed, as I have already said, mentions the name of the person first attacked—"John Jamieson."

Dr. King even seems to take some credit to himself for going so far as to mention the name of the first sufferer. He says, "I shall supply the omission; it was John Jamieson," etc.

I would ask, why did Dr. King not give a full account of this most interesting outbreak of the fever? It occurred, as I have elsewhere said, in a person well supplied with the necessaries of life, in a large, well-ventilated house; and although not, as Dr. King states, "*after an interval of months, and the disappearance of the disease both in man and beast,*" still there was an appreciable lapse of time between the cessation of the cases at Moradinha, and the attack of Jamieson. The investigation surely belonged to Dr. King

rather than to me, as the occurrence took place *after* I left the island, but *before* Dr. King reached it. His instructions specially state, that besides the fever following the visit of the Eclair, he is to investigate "also any *previous* or *subsequent* epidemic or fever which may have appeared at Boa Vista." (Dr. King's recent work, p. 106.) He has, however, declined the task, and I thus feel called upon to state the facts as briefly as I can consistently with their fair exposition.

In my "Report," (pp. 94, 95, 110,) in my "Remarks on Dr. King's Report," (p. 12,) and in the "Observations on the Second Report on Quarantine by the General Board of Health," (p. 31,) I have spoken of the outbreak at Moradinha, and have stated that the patients were convalescent on the 13th June. At that date they were out of bed, but thin and ill-looking.

John Jamieson was complaining when I left the island, and took some medicine from me the day on which I sailed (July 15). On the 19th or 20th he was laid up, and recovered after extreme peril.

By interval of course is meant the period intervening between the recovery of the last cases of one outbreak and the attack of the first cases of another. If the outbreak in question is to be tested in this way, the interval will be reduced to about *one month*,—in fact, to considerably less than that, if we are to date the cessation of the preceding outbreak from the period of the complete recovery of the patients.

How, then, I would ask, does Dr. King obtain his interval of *months*? How can he say that the fever broke out again *about the rainy season*, when he himself tells us in his Report, p. 9, that *the rains began about the middle of August*? Dr. King, I imagine, will find the re-appearance of the fever at Moradinha in May, "a stumbling block" in the way of his "*interval of months*," which even he, as a professed remover of such obstacles, must fail to remove.

What confidence is to be placed in a Report which is wholly inaccurate at the very point when there existed all the elements for the inquirer to procure his information with the most perfect accuracy?

In his recent work, p. 79, Dr. King says:—"We are to infer, then, that this first attack in 1846 resulted from contagion; but from whom was the disease derived?" "Jamieson," continues Dr. King, "ten months before, had been in almost hourly contact with the people of the Eclair, both on board and at the fort, and eight months previously attended night and day on Mr. Kenny."

Dr. King here, as everywhere else, repudiates contagion. Still, it is to be presumed that Jamieson's attack, as well as that of the others, had a cause, and, as I have said before,

it was much more Dr. King's duty than mine to find one. Although it is not always easy to trace the progress from person to person of a disease prevailing in a locality with occasional interruptions during nearly twelve months, and consequently during *all seasons*, I can have no hesitation in stating how, in my opinion, Jamieson's illness may have arisen. He saw the patients at Moradinha on several occasions during their convalescence, as well as during their illness, and he was in the houses there within a week before he was attacked.

"It is known that marsh fevers have become developed weeks and even months after exposure to the exciting cause. The incubative period of the African fever appears to have been in many cases twelve, fourteen, fifteen, or even twenty-two days. (Dr. Bryson, "Climate and Disease," &c., pp. 151-2-3, and 233.) It appears that the disease did not seem to be of a milder type after this long incubative period, and therefore the mere severity of the hæmagastric pestilence does not argue a short period of latency."(a) Our knowledge, indeed, of the incubative period of yellow fever, or of the time at which a person suffering from a contagious disease ceases to have the power of communicating the same disease to others, is not so definite as to shut out contact with these people as a probable cause of the disease in Jamieson. Moreover, the analogy derived from scarlet fever and other diseases admitted to be contagious may be adduced to support the view of his having been infected in the houses, even after the recovery of the patients. I have an account of fifteen cases immediately succeeding Jamieson's. They were chiefly among people of the better class, and in each case communication with sick persons can be proved.

Are we to infer that Jamieson's attack was due to malaria? for if so, what evidence have we of its existence? Not a drop of rain, by Dr. King's own showing, fell, until weeks afterwards. The patient was in a fine, roomy, open house, as were the others (Senhor Theodore Antonio Lima and Senhor Francisco Antonio Spencer, etc.), who had visited Jamieson, and were attacked immediately after him. Neither he nor they wanted the necessaries of life. None of them were drunkards. They had the best water and provisions the island could afford. Dr. King evidently has despaired of calling malaria to his aid here. He even seems to have lost confidence in "privies" and "dustholes," for these certainly existed at the Consulate, if not in the houses of the other persons named. Why did Dr. King not get out of the difficulty at once by invoking "an epidemical constitution of the atmosphere?"

---

(a) *British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review*, No. II., p. 395.

But, as has been already said, Jamieson's attack must have been due to something; and Dr. King seems to think the fact of his escaping after contact with the people of the Eclair, and Mr. Kenny, the surgeon, in 1845, proof absolute against contagion. He, in short, seems to have arrived at the illogical conclusion, that as Jamieson escaped after exposure to sources of contagion in 1845, it was not possible that he could contract fever by exposure to a cause of the same kind in 1846. But, if reasoning of this sort is to be allowed, we may with equal justice declare, that the fact of his escaping in 1845 the dreadful malaria alleged to have existed in the ship and at the fort, as well as the influence of the assumed epidemical constitution of the atmosphere at the same period, argues incontestably against his liability to these influences, even could it be proved that any of them existed in 1846.

But the proof is wholly the other way. There is nothing to show anything like an atmospherical morbid cause; and Dr. King will hardly tell us that the atmosphere was epidemical because there was fever, and that there was fever because the atmosphere was epidemical.

Besides the strong positive evidence which in my report I brought forward in support of my views regarding the disease at Boa Vista, I also adduced instances of negative testimony to the same effect, derived from the perfect immunity secured to nearly sixty persons segregating themselves from infected districts. The localities I mentioned as having been resorted to for seclusion were, "Espinguera," near Mount Broyal; "Cantor," near Mount Ochello; and "Agua dos Caballos," a little over a mile from "Cabeca dos Tharafes."

Dr. King has nowhere made any mention of these places, and as he never was near them it is probable he was ignorant of their very existence, until he saw them spoken of in my report, after his return to England. But he has no right, seeing that he took little or no opportunity of examining the island, to question the "necessity of my sleeping in the open air during four successive nights."

Had I contented myself with the information derived from messengers, or had I rested satisfied with the account given by one individual of the progress of the fever in several villages; had I, in short, conducted the investigation by proxies, I should doubtless have saved myself much trouble and much labour. Unfortunately for my case, but perhaps not detrimentally to the inquiry, I imagined that everything worth doing had best be done by myself, and therefore arose the necessity to "sleep out at night." Any one at all acquainted with Boa Vista must be aware, that a proper examination of the island, including the complete circuit of its coast, could not otherwise be made. When Dr. King



"attempts" to speak of what is necessary for topographical description or meteorological observation, he clearly goes a step beyond his comprehension.

Before leaving these places of refuge, I should like to ask Dr. King by what process of reasoning he considers the "negative evidence" which they afford to tell more against contagion than for it?

I imagine that all reasoning men will require of him something more apposite than the following case, which he seems to think conclusive as regards the position he has here assumed.

At page 80 of his recent work Dr. King observes, "The case of F. A. Ascensao (at p. 70 Dr. M'William's Report) is an excellent illustration of this immunity in consequence of seclusion. When asked (1420), 'Have you seen any sick people?' He replies, 'Yes, I have; I took goats to the house of Matthew Soares de Graca at Cabecada, and he was then sick. I stopped all night under the same roof with him, but in a different room.'

"Yet," continues Dr. King triumphantly, "Ascensao and his whole family escaped the fever in their place of seclusion at Bella Vista."

Here we have another illustration of Dr. King's views and reasoning on the subject of contagion. According to Dr. King, a contagious disease ought to affect *all* who approach those labouring under it. It is to Dr. King sufficient proof against the contagion of the Boa Vista fever, that Ascensao was not infected, because he escaped after "*stopping one night under the same roof with Soares, although in a different room.*"(a)

Why did Dr. King not attempt to explain away the immunity of the persons who segregated themselves at "Cantor," at "Espinguera," and at "Agua dos Caballos." These cases present a large basis for general induction. The case selected by Dr. King is limited to a single individual.

Dr. King is naturally very desirous to absolve himself from a charge of misrepresentation which he alleges I have brought against him in regard to Dr. Almeida's views as to the nature of the disease.(b)

(a) The following sentence, part of which I have taken leave to italicise, affords another specimen of Dr. King's views and mode of reasoning on the subject of contagion:—

"Supposing, however, that Luis Pathi was attacked with fever on the 17th, and that he had been exposed to infection on the 13th, when he is said to have assisted in hoisting the sick on board, *one cannot but infer that the same specific poison, (emanating from the bodies of the sick,) then possessed a virulence equally dangerous to ALL within the range of its influence, and which must have been recognised, not only in the features of the disease in the individual, but in its IMMEDIATE transmission to ALL who approached him during his illness.*"

(b) Dr. King, p. 93 of his recent work, says, "I never asked Dr. Almeida whether he was a contagionist or not." He did not put the question



Having already acquitted Dr. King of anything approaching to wilful misrepresentation, I can only in justification of what I have elsewhere stated, refer to the evidence of Dr. Almeida given to myself (Dr. M'William's "Report," pp. 75, 76), to the evidence contained in his letter ("Remarks on Dr. King's Report," p. 14), which was written *before* he saw Dr. King's Report, and to that recorded in another letter, addressed to myself, and written *after* he saw that document. — ("Observations," etc., p. 32.)

With regard to what passed between Dr. Almeida and Dr. King in casual conversation, I submit that information obtained in this manner cannot be allowed to stand against deliberately written and recorded evidence.

That Dr. King understood Dr. Almeida in the sense he represents, I have not the slightest doubt. I am, however, equally certain, that he wholly misunderstood him. Dr. Almeida indignantly and emphatically denies that he used words conveying the meaning attributed to him by Dr. King. Now, I can very easily, under the circumstances, reconcile a misunderstanding of this nature, arising between two gentlemen, without resorting to either of the offensive alternatives adopted by Dr. King and Dr. Almeida. (a)

Dr. King knew nothing of the Portuguese language; Dr. Almeida spoke English but indifferently. In such circumstances, surely a misapprehension of meaning on both sides might easily occur.

But, after all, I am at a loss to perceive what advantage could have accrued to the doctrine which Dr. King espouses, even had he succeeded, to use an elegant expression of his own, in "drawing" the desired letter from Dr. Almeida. All that he wished Dr. Almeida to say was, that he had on former occasions seen black vomit among patients affected with the remittent fever of the island, "in about one in every fifty patients."

Did Dr. King ever learn from Dr. Almeida, or any one

---

directly; but he took a very good method of ascertaining what were Dr. Almeida's views on the subject. Dr. Almeida in his letter ("Observations of Second Report on Quarantine," p. 32,) says, "from conversations that Dr. Leao and myself had with Dr. King, we discovered that his object was to prove that the yellow fever was not imported into this island by the steamer Eclair. He always found us opposed to this; and we proved to him by positive facts that he was in error."

(a) Dr. King, p. 96 of his recent work, says, "It would have been very easy for Dr. Almeida to have replied to my letter when I was on the island; but I can easily understand his reason for not wishing to commit himself in writing. After reading the letter which Dr. Miller has drawn from him," (another of Dr. King's mistakes) "it would be idle to speculate upon his reasons for making contradictory statements."

On the other hand, Dr. Almeida declares that Dr. King "has been pleased to pervert these conversations to suit his own erroneous views, not remembering, perhaps, that, to foist them upon the public, he has misused the name of one who, like himself, is in the Profession."—(Letter in "Observation on Second Report on Quarantine," etc.)

else, that a disease had previously existed at Boa Vista with the general characteristics of the fever that followed the Eclair's visit; that proved fatal to one in fifteen of the whole population; to nearly 50 per cent. of the European Portuguese; and to seven out of eleven Americans and English, who remained on the island?

Why, neither from Lind, nor from Purdys, sailing direction; nor from the Salem (American) paper; nor from Captain Fitzroy; nor from Lieutenant Chelenichi; nor from any of his other authorities, known or anonymous, has Dr. King been able to show that a single case of yellow fever ever existed on the island of Boa Vista before the arrival of the Eclair.(a)

Dr. King is "puzzled" to know to whom the reply to the letter which he wrote to the Governor-General at the end of January, 1847, (my copy gives date February 2nd, 1847,) was addressed. I can enlighten Dr. King on this subject. It was not addressed "to Dr. M'William, to Mr. Rendall the Consul, or Mr. Miller, at St. Nicolas," but, as people will naturally be prepared to expect, to Dr. King himself; and his leaving the Cape de Verds so shortly after his own letter was written, may easily account for his not receiving the answer. There was no occasion for Dr. King to "declare most solemnly" that the answer had never reached him. It is still by me, and is quite at the service of Dr. King or any one else who may be desirous of seeing the document "*in extenso*."

Having now completed a most irksome and disagreeable task, it remains for me to observe how much it has pained me, in going over Dr. King's pages, to find him throughout indulging in a spirit at all times and under any circumstances unseemly, but particularly unbecoming an officer of his age and rank.

He cannot view evidence, as taken, recorded, or interpreted by others, except through the medium of suspicion and doubt. Indeed, motives of unfairness and dishonesty are more than once attributed to Sir William Pym. As regards myself, I am more or less traduced in almost every page.

It is true Sir William and I are equally indifferent to the

---

(a) A work entitled "Ensaio sobre a Statistica das Possesoes Portuguezas," par Jose Joaquim Lopes de Lima—a gentleman who knew the Cape de Verd Archipelago well—was published in 1844. In Part I., page 52, the following passage occurs:—"I have said sufficient regarding the island of Boa Vista. It remains only for me to add, that, although the island is not so healthy a place as either 'Brava,' 'San Antonio,' or 'San Vincente,' yet that it is quite as healthy and much cooler than Fogo; it is much healthier than either San Nicolas or Mayo—not to mention the mortiferous 'San Jago.' There is no endemic disease at Boa Vista. Intermittent fevers are rare, and are easily cured there; and so is ophthalmia. There is less of other diseases than in many parts of Portugal itself."

opinions of Dr. King on this as on any other matter. Nevertheless it is to be regretted, for the sake of the Colleges, the medical corporate bodies, the Profession in general, and others who lately have interested themselves in the cause of the naval medical service, that at the present day one of its members should, even in the ardour of controversy, have descended to language the tone and spirit of which carries us back to a period in the history of that service which we would fain cast into oblivion.

His Excellency, Don José de Norronha, the Governor-General, in his oft-quoted letter to the Consul-General at Gibraltar, concludes in these words—"I therefore calmly wait the result."

So Dr. King, in like manner, winds up his recent work by saying, "I appeal to the judgment of mankind, and calmly wait the result."

"But there,  
I doubt, all likeness ends between the pair."

Don José soon saw his error, and became convinced that the disease was introduced into Boa Vista by the Eclair, and therefore was not "indigenous." What is more, he had the courage to avow, that his first impressions were wrong.

Judging from Dr. King's writings, there seems no reason to suppose that he will, like Don José, become a convert to the doctrine of contagion in yellow fever, either as regards Boa Vista or elsewhere. On the present occasion, therefore, he is deprived the opportunity of showing the extent to which he likewise can exercise the noble candour displayed by the late excellent Governor-General of the Cape de Verds.